



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,516	04/03/2006	Alan Bradburn	8952000004	6946
27572	7590	06/20/2008		
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 828			ILAN, RUTH	
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/574,516

Applicant(s)

BRADBURN, ALAN

Examiner

Ruth Ilan

Art Unit

3616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 April 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/3/2006
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hartmeyer et al. (US 5,492,363.) See Figure 7 and col. 7, lines 45-57. Hartmeyer et al. teaches an inflatable airbag including an elastic inner membrane (52, described as being in the place of 68 of Figure 7 in col. 7, lines 46) provided in the peripheral wall of the airbag (64) and an outer membrane with a pucker (66) that is, regarding claim 9, integral with the material of the airbag. A plurality of vent holes (82) are in the inner membrane and the outer membrane extends across the inner membrane and the vent holes. The pucker defines an outlet flow path and the inner membrane is configured to stretch and seal (see col. 7, lines 40-45.) The inner membrane is secured across an aperture 967) formed in the fabric of the airbag. The inner membrane is stitched to the fabric (at 74.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 3616

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartmeyer et al. (US 5,492,363.) Hartmeyer et al. is discussed above, and with respect to claim 2 does not specifically disclose silicone. Hartmeyer does however indicate that rubber is considered to be suitable. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to choose silicone as the material of construction, because silicone is a type of rubber that is well known for its elasticity and it has been held to be an obvious matter of design choice to choose a material based on its suitability for the intended purpose. Regarding claim 7, while in the embodiment discussed above of Figure 7, the outer membrane is integral, Hartmeyer et al. also teaches that it is contemplated to provide a separate outer member that is stitched to the airbag (see col. 4, line 39.) This approach is useful because it allows for preassembly of the valve before it is sewn to the air bag. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form the outer member of the embodiment shown in Figure 7 from a separate strip, in order to allow for preassembly of the valve. Regarding claim 8, Hartmeyer teaches embodiments that include a loose fold that is open at both ends, and the combination of such an outer member in the embodiment of Figure 7 would have been obvious because the substitution of one outer member for another disclosed by Hartmeyer would have

Art Unit: 3616

yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Regarding claim 6, glued seams are a well known engineering expedient, and it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to glue the seams, in place of sewing, as a matter of design choice.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Moon, Okada et al., Ikawa et al., and Matsuoka et al. teach air bag vents of interest.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruth Ilan whose telephone number is 571-272-6673. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Dickson can be reached on 571-272-6669. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ruth Ilan
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3616

/Ruth Ilan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3616